

Local Boundary Commission

From: "Don Quarberg" <dmq@wildak.net>
To: <lbc@dced.state.ak.us>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2003 4:56 PM
Subject: Tanana Basin Borough Comments

I have serious doubt that the Economic strength of the suggested Tanana Basin Borough can support itself. I find it difficult to understand why we have to support another level of parasitic government in order to contribute to our education funding. Senator Gary Wilkins thinks this is the only way - why not reinstate the "School Tax" on residents living outside organized boroughs?

What does the Tanana Basin Borough have for an Economic base:

- 1: Alyeska Oil Pipeline and Pump Station #9. Doesn't the State already collect on the value of these facilities, and wouldn't the State Lose that revenue if it were to be collected by a new borough? In other words aren't we "robbing Peter to pay Paul"? Sounds like a lose - lose situation, the State loses revenue and we are forced to create a saprophytic government (Administrative costs) to collect that money and support the school, which in turn results in less total money for education.
- 2: Pogo Mine. It is still questionable how long that will operate (11 years Max we are told). Is that sound business judgment to create an entire borough on one gold mine?
3. Agriculture. The agriculture economy is so weak that any tax would simply kill it entirely.
4. Forestry. This industry is in no better economic condition than is agriculture.
- 5 Tourism. What tourist attraction exists in this proposed borough - none - other than the fact that those traveling up the Alaska Highway would have to pass through it on their way to Fairbanks, Anchorage, Valdez, Seward, Homer, Denali or wherever.

That's it! Would invest in a borough given these risky or short term ventures. Enact a school tax and spare us the burden of another layer of inept government!

Sincerely, Don Quarberg, HC 60 Box 3070, Delta Jct. AK 99737